

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated March 1, 2006.

A petition for extension of time (one month) and the fee therefor are enclosed.

The objection to the Abstract has been noted. The Abstract has been revised.

Reconsideration of the subject objection to the Abstract is requested.

The applicant has further noted the rejection, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as set forth in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office Action. The subject claims have been amended in a manner which is believed to be fully responsive to the grounds of rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of said rejection is requested.

Substantively, claims 1-4, 8-10, 11-12 and 13 stand rejected on grounds of obviousness over Adamson (5,717,863) in view of Klug (6,823,327). Claim 5 stands rejected on grounds of obviousness over Adamson and Klug, in further view of H. Oden (3,510,594). Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected on grounds of obviousness over Adamson, Klug and Oden, in further view of Gainsboro (5,926,533). Claims 14-18 and 21-25 stand rejected on grounds of obviousness over Adamson and Klug. Still further, claim 19 stands rejected on grounds of obviousness over Adamson, Klug and Oden. Lastly, claim 20 stands rejected on grounds of obviousness over Adamson, Klug, Oden and Gainsboro. Reconsideration is requested in view of the amendments to the claims herein and the following remarks.

The independent claims of the present application, including newly presented independent claim 26, are directed to a very specific web-enabled communication system that permits the establishment of communication between a first party and a second party, based on explicitly set forth features that are clearly defined in the independent claims. Among those features is the feature that a caller, such as the second party, receives the web business card of the first party and is provided with a specific facility that requires the caller (the second party) to enter calling, i.e., connection information, into the web-enabled business card via a specific inputting window. That information is entered to correspond to certain call buttons defined in the business card and identified with the owner of the business card. Thereafter, the system as a whole establishes a communication based thereon. This facility and features are nowhere

described in the prior art of record. That is, none of the primary references relied upon, such as Adamson and Klug, disclose the specifically claimed features.

In fact, the independent claims in the application go further by providing for the web business card information which is stored on a web to be communicated to potential callers via e-mail, entered by the party which creates the web business card. The Office Action seizes on a secondary reference (Klug) for its nonanalogous mention of e-mail information. But Klug states that the caller (not the callee) provides his/her e-mail. Moreover, there is no suggestion or motivation in the prior art to combine this reference, which, in any event, does not even teach the specific feature of e-mailing business card information in the manner of the present invention, except if one were to (impermissibly) use hindsight. Apparently, the Office Action actually recognizes this deficiency of the prior art because, in the final analysis, the Office Action resorts to the argument that it is "inherent" in the references that one should create the business card with the various features and elements as set forth in applicant's claims. However, that is clearly not so and, to the extent that an argument of inherency is applied, the applicant objects to same for the simple reason that it is contradicted by the actual teachings of these references.

The above assertion, that the prior art does not teach the creation of a web-based business card, in which the first party (which created the business card) causes that information to be e-mailed to a list of e-mail addresses, for the recipients to fill out the information missing on the business card (such as their own calling information) and thereafter the system establishing communication in response to a request, is nowhere thought or suggested in the prior art of record, is explicated in greater detail below as follows.

(1) Distinguishable Technical Features of the Present Invention

In the present invention, the web business card includes one or more call buttons having a requesting function of a call connection, via the call connection service system, with their corresponding phone number(s) of the first party when clicked by a second party who received it (refer to the third and sixth steps in claim 1 and the limitations of web server in claim 14).

According to the claimed call connection through the medium of the web business card, the call buttons included in a web business card correspond to phone numbers of the first party one-by-one (refer to the second step of claim 1) and are also assigned with ID number

one-by-one when the web business card requested for issuance is stored in the system (refer to the third step of claim 1).

Further, the web business card prepared by the first party is transmitted to second parties designated by the first party via e-mail (refer to the third step in claim 1 and the limitations of web server in claim 14). For a call connection service, the call connection service system provides the second client computer (which received the web business card of the first party via e-mail) with a phone number inputting window, when the second client computer opens the received web business card. Thereby, the second party is able to access the system with the URL contained in the received web business card (refer to the fifth step in claim 1 and the limitations of web server in claim 14).

To make a call, the second party clicks one of the call buttons in the received web business card after entering his or her (i.e., caller's) call connection information into the phone number inputting window, on his or her computer. To now establish a call between the first party and the second party, the call connection service system uses a phone number of the first party and an ID number corresponding to the clicked call button, together with the call connection information of the second party (refer to the last step of claim 1 and overall of claim 14).

Moreover, the available call connection types between the first party and the second party in claims 1 and 14 is a phone to 'any communication means' called destination. That is, the first party always use a phone as a communication means and the second party may use any communication means which includes, but not limited to, a phone and a computer (refer to the second step and the sixth step in claim 1 and the limitations of the web server and the call server in claim 14).

(2) Comparison to Adamson's Invention

In contrast, Adamson fails to teach such web business card containing any call button capable of automatically requesting or initiating a call connection to any other party when clicked (refer to column 6 last paragraph). Instead, Adamson discloses a common connect dialog box 270 which contains a connect command button 286a, as shown in FIG. 9, by which initiation of

connection with the connection address formulated is made possible (refer to column 8 lines 18-20).

However, Adamson's common connect dialog box 270 is basically different from the web business card defined in claims 1 and 14 because its form is utterly different from that of the web business card so that it cannot be used as a web business card (refer to column 7 lines 62-66 and FIGURE 9) and it is a mere user interface simply displayed by the connect function without involving e-mail transmission. Accordingly, the web business card of claims 1 and 14 works for a functional medium for the call connection between the first party and the second party who received it, while the Adamson's bizcard is, to the contrary, nothing but a simple information card, that does not have any functions involving requesting or initiating a call connection. That is, the functions of the web business card of this application and the bizcard of the prior art are quite different.

Moreover, the call connection type described by Adamson is limited to only PC-to-PC calls, which is different from that of the present invention. In addition, Adamson discloses only a system for PC-to-PC conferencing which is not described to be a web-based system. Accordingly, a service environment for the PC-to-PC conferencing does not need to use a telecommunication network such as PSTN and a mobile communication network, while the present invention needs to use not only the telecommunication network but also the Internet (refer to the preamble and the last step of claim 1 and the preamble and the limitations of the call server in claim 14).

Due to these differences, Adamson employs a different call connection scheme. That is, in order for a caller to initiate a connection with a callee, the caller is required to enter or select a callee's connection number (refer to column 8 lines 7-13), which is not the case with the instant claims.

#### (4) Comparison to Klug's Invention

Klug teaches, as indicated by the Examiner, a registration system that is capable of registering a user to several websites simultaneously. However, the Examiner's contention that the transmission of a web business card through one or more e-mail addresses designated by the first party is taught by the registration system of Klug, is respectfully traversed by the Applicant.

Klug mentions 'e-mail address' only in column 8 line 52 and the e-mail address is recited as one of basic information of a user (i.e., a first party) rather than a second party (i.e., anyone except a user). Accordingly, Klug fails to teach the transmission of a web business card via e-mail defined in claims 1 and 14 of the present invention.

Accordingly, the applied two references, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the noted features recited in independent claims 1 and 14, as amended. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 14, as amended, are believed to be allowable over Adamson, in view of Klug. The dependent claims are allowable over the applied reference on their on merits and for at least the reasons as argued above with respect to independent claims 1, 14 and 26.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims of record distinguish over the prior art for the reasons noted above. This is of course true with respect to the independent claims and certainly and more forcefully with respect to their dependent claims.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June 30, 2006.

MAX MOSKOWITZ


Name of applicant, assignee or  
Registered Representative

Signature

June 30, 2006

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

  
MAX MOSKOWITZ

Registration No.: 30,576

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700

MM:ns